

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 5-7, 12-14 and 18-20 were previously withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al., (hereinafter “Yamaguchi”), US Pat. No. 5,243,482 in view of Furuichi et al., (hereinafter “Furuichi”), US Pat. No. 6,731,462. Claims 2, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi, US Pat. No. 5,243,482 in view of Furuichi, US Pat. No. 6,731,462 and further in view of Coon, US Pub. No. 2001/0013993.

Applicants submit the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least “[a] suspension assembly, comprising ... a slider fixture formed on the suspension to couple with portions of at least two surfaces of the slider other than a surface facing the data storage medium and other than a surface having a set of connecting pads” (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

The Examiner asserts Yamaguchi discloses the relevant limitations, citing Figures 1, 3 and 5 generally, and column 7, lines 28-30. See Office Action dated 6/3/2009, paragraph 3. Applicants disagree.

Figure 1 of Yamaguchi is a partial cross-sectional view of a magnetic head support mechanism; it does not include references to pads of any sort.

Figure 3 describes, among other things, a slider embodiment 1 comprising finger portions 52, central tongue portion 53, load projection 54 and stepped portion 57. It does not describe at least a slider fixture formed on the suspension to couple with portions of at least two surfaces of the slider other than a surface facing the data storage medium and other than a surface having a set of connecting pads.

Figure 5 describes another view of a slider embodiment wherein the finger portion 52 is connected to step member 55 and coupling member 56. None of these elements describe at least the relevant limitations discussed above at all. Specifically, the Examiner's current rejection has failed to cite at least 1) to a surface having a set of connecting pads and 2) to a slider fixture with portions of at least two surfaces of a slider other than a surface facing a data storage medium and a surface having the set of connecting pads (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1). Indeed, cited Figure 5 does not include reference to any pads at all, and the Examiner does not cite to any purported connecting pads either. Applicants submit the Yamaguchi reference, including cited Figures 1, 3 and 5, fails to describe at least the relevant limitations.

Similarly, Figures 2, 4, and 6 of Yamaguchi fail to teach or suggest the relevant limitations as described in claim 1 as well. For example, Figures 4 and 6 disclose slider 1, magnetic head 2, and "slider floating surface" 10; they do not teach or suggest at least a slider fixture to couple with portions of at least two surfaces of the slider other than a surface facing the data storage medium and other than a surface having a set of connecting pads.

Furuichi also fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yamaguchi. Furuichi is directed to slider and head assembly, but does not teach or suggest the relevant limitations of claim 1. For example, Figure 1 of Furuichi describes a head assembly with slider 1, actuator 2, and suspension 3. The actuator 2 is lowered slot 13 of slider 1. However, both Figure 1 and (the similar) Figure 2 of Furuichi do not teach or suggest a slider fixture formed on the suspension to couple with portions of at least two surfaces of the slider other than a surface facing the data storage medium and other than a surface having a set of connecting pads. Indeed, the Furuichi does not teach or suggest a slider fixture as described at all. Therefore, as stated above, Furuichi

fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yamaguchi.

Coon fails to make up for the deficiencies of Yamaguchi. Specifically, Coon is directed to a flexure slider bonding system; it does not teach or suggest at least a slider fixture formed on the suspension to couple with portions of at least two surfaces of the slider other than a surface facing the data storage medium and other than a surface having a set of connecting pads” (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1). Indeed, the embodiments described in Coon do not include anything similar to at least the slider fixture described in the claims of the present application. *See* Figures 6-10.

Therefore, since the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1, the current §102 rejections are lacking and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable for at least the reasons described above. Claims 3-4, 10-11, and 17 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: September 3, 2009

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501